

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-68 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the latest Office Action, claims 1-68 were rejected. With this amendment, claims 1, 30, and 51 are amended, and new claims 69-71 are added. On the basis of the following remarks, consideration of this application and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

### **Comment regarding the construction of claim 51 in light of the restriction requirement**

In the latest Office Action, the examiner stated that because claim 51 is readable on elected Species I, claim 51 “is being interpreted as time based media is processed by a media processing system of a printer.” In contrast, Species II from the restriction requirement was directed to processing the time-based media in part within the printing system. To avoid any confusion about the scope of the claims, Applicants point out for the official record that all of the claims cover systems in which either some or all of the media processing is performed on a printing system. Stated another way, none of the claims require that the media processing be performed entirely on the printer. For example, although claims 1-50 recite processing of time-based media performed by components of a printer, they do not contain any limitations that preclude additional media processing from being performed on another system coupled to the printer.

### **Response to rejections**

Each of the claims has been rejected as made obvious by a combination of various patent references; however these rejections have been mooted by the claim amendments to each of the independent claims. Applicants respectfully assert that the amended claims are patentable over the art of record for the following reasons.

As amended, the claims define a printing system that processes time-based media to produce both printed and electronic representations of the time-based media. The printed representation of the media includes multiple representations of the media at various time locations. In addition, the printed representation further includes machine-readable codes (such as bar codes) that link these multiple printed representations at various time locations to the corresponding time locations within the electronic representation. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references.

To illustrate the possible uses of such a system, as claimed, one of the example implementations of the claimed printing system is described in paragraph 57 of the specification. This paragraph explains: “In one embodiment, the printer 100 converts a digital audio file, such as a MIDI file, into a paper representation as a musical score. Optionally, the printer 100 also converts the input data to another audio format, such as MP3, that could be played on other devices, such as a cell phone. Bar codes can be added to a printed paper representation of the media to let the user play the audio corresponding to lines of music on a remote device or through the speaker on the printer.”

In this example implementation, the printer creates printed copy of a musical score and an electronic song file for the time-based media, which in this case is a MIDI file. Importantly, the printer links the printed score to the electronic song file by including multiple bar codes on the printed score. These bar codes link the different parts of the musical score (e.g., “printed representations of the media at different time locations”) to locations within the MP3 song file that correspond to those parts of the printed score (e.g., “the electronic representation of the media at the corresponding time locations”). These printed and electronic representations of the MIDI file could then be used by a system that allows a user to select a portion of the score using

a bar code reader, and then plays that portion of the song file corresponding to the selected portion of the score.

The claimed linking of the printed and electronic representations of the time-based media, using machine-readable codes printed on the printed representation, where the processing for producing the printed and electronic representations is performed at least in part on a printing system, is not disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references. Accordingly, the claims, as amended, are patentable over these references.

Based on the foregoing, the application is in condition for allowance of all claims, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the examiner believes for any reason direct contact would help advance the prosecution of this case to allowance, the examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER E. HART, JONATHAN J. HULL, JAMEY  
GRAHAM, AND KURT PIERSON

Dated: February 26, 2007

By: /Robert A. Hulse/

Robert A. Hulse, Reg. No. 48,473  
Attorney for Applicant  
Fenwick & West LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (415) 875-2444  
Fax: (415) 281-1350